

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Pre-U Certificate

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 series

9769 HISTORY

9769/72

Paper 5k (Special Subject: Winston Churchill, 1914–1946),
maximum raw mark 60

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2014 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	72

- 1 (a) How far does Document D corroborate the impression given in Document C concerning Churchill's relationships with his wartime colleagues? [10]

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other, or differ, and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a clear sense of critical evaluation.

In Document C, Alanbrooke takes a critical view of Churchill's style and relationships with his colleagues, but not unmixed with admiration and respect. Although he is seen as a difficult man to work with, Alanbrooke pays tribute to Churchill's 'marvellous qualities and superhuman genius'. He is impatient of opposition ('brushing everything aside'), gives the impression of wanting his own way and inclined to dismiss planners when their ideas do not suit him. Candidates should make use of the provenance of the document, the content and the reputation of Alanbrooke.

In Document D, Attlee gives a rather more balanced picture. Although there was disagreement (occasional according to Attlee), there was a good deal of discussion and a general climate of collegiality. In the end, it seems, Churchill was prepared to take advice and to concede, when faced with opposition, that there might, after all, be no value in a particular plan. In the end, it seems, Churchill always accepted the verdict of the Chiefs of Staff. Candidates may take the opportunity of discussing the approaches of a politician (D) and of a general (C).

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that Churchill's effectiveness as a wartime leader has been overestimated? [20]

The answer should treat the documents as a set and should make effective use of each, although, depending on the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong on both depth and range. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument should be well constructed. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood. Where appropriate, an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected.

Document A is very largely concerned with Churchill's capacity to inspire the British public, in particular by the use of oratory, and to express a strong sense of defiance. Candidates may comment on the typicality of the reaction expressed. Some echoes of Churchill's capacity to inspire can be found in C and, to some extent, in B. Document B gives the impression of a born war leader and his fascination with the whole process. The burden of office, and the delight Churchill took in it, has some echoes in C. In Document C, Alanbrooke is highly critical of Churchill's strategic sense and his limited ability to see the whole problem across the board or to recognise the connections between different theatres. Churchill is also liable to pick upon an isolated operation without giving sufficient thought or planning to it, brushing aside opposition, changing planners. There is also evidence of an over-optimistic view of operations on which he has set his heart, perhaps without full consideration.

Document D presents a more favourable interpretation of Churchill's gifts as a war leader, in particular his 'driving force' (a quality also referred to in B). There were occasions when Churchill's ideas were met with disagreement (pet schemes, perhaps, as referred to in C) but these were generally resolved and he always 'accepted the verdict of the Chiefs of Staff'. Best (in Document E) confirms many of the impressions given in B, C and D of Churchill's

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	72

driving force but lends support to Alanbrooke's reservations about lack of careful planning and Churchill's impatience with what he saw as obstruction. The impression of impatience with criticism in **E** is confirmed in **C**. Best details some issues not explored elsewhere such as Churchill's 'favourite' generals but, more particularly, the Prime Minister's attention to the 'war machinery', in particular, perhaps, Bletchley Park. From wider contextual knowledge (confirmed in a more general sense by **C**) candidates may add to the picture of Churchill's war leadership by making reference to serious errors such as the support given to Greece in 1941 and to the Dieppe Raid in 1942. Further balance might be given to the picture by Churchill's part in the creation of the Grand Alliance.

2 Assess Churchill's achievements in the First World War.

[30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected. It is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. An even coverage of Churchill's career in the First World War is to be expected, with a good sense of balance of roles and evaluation of them. A good deal of prominence is certainly to be expected in dealing with his First Lordship of the Admiralty, but other aspects should not be neglected. In the early stages of the war, Churchill was responsible for mobilising the fleet and for intervening in small operations in Ostend and Dunkirk as well as his mission to Antwerp. Candidates may be expected to give some account of the Dardanelles campaign. However, the approach should be analytical and with specific reference to Churchill's responsibility for the campaign, as well as the part played by others (including, for example, Fisher, Robeck and Hamilton).

The principal issues might include – the strategy of the campaign, the responsibility of the War Council/Cabinet, the ships alone/combined operations approach, the rift between Churchill and Fisher, lack of support by the War Office and the 'Westerners'. Churchill's resignation as the First Lord of the Admiralty was followed by his appointment as Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. He was excluded from the War Council and then, in November, served on the Western Front, taking command of a battalion, and was concerned with the development of the tank. There is evidence of bravery and he emerged with credit before returning to Westminster. In July 1917 he was appointed as Minister of Munitions with a post in the Cabinet. He was responsible for important reorganisation of this Ministry and remained in office until the end of the war.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

The Dardanelles campaign was the most damaging episode of his experiences in the First World War and, perhaps, of his whole career. It came back to haunt him on more than one occasion. Here, the argument as to responsibility may be sharpened and there are good opportunities for engagement with the historiography. There may be a strong element of adventurism running through his whole career at this stage. Nevertheless, considerable credit is due for Churchill's tenure of the Ministry of Munitions. Candidates should attempt to establish a balance.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	72

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

3 How well justified was Churchill’s stance on rearmament in the 1930s? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected. It is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Churchill has the reputation of being the relentless critic of the British government under the Prime Ministerships of Macdonald, Baldwin and Chamberlain. The principal theme of rearmament is connected to the theme of appeasement. Churchill, in writing his history of the Second World War, certainly sought to present himself in this light (history is written by the victors). However, the picture is far from straightforward and there is an important debate to be conducted. Perhaps Churchill was ‘right in the end’ but he was at times very isolated in his stance, and it is too simple a view that Churchill could see the threat of the dictators which the government could not. It could be argued that successive governments took adequate steps to ensure that British security from invasion was safeguarded. The whole issue of rearmament was technical and, in some sectors, subject to obsolescence.

By 1933 Churchill was already advocating rapid rearmament. He was concerned to expose anxieties about the deficiencies of the RAF and, certainly by the end of 1933, to raise the alarm about German rearmament. Meanwhile, it could be argued that the government rearmed as quickly as public opinion and the economy would allow. It took time for the conventional view that the ‘bomber will always get through’ (Baldwin 1932) to be revised and the development of fighters challenged this thesis. A rearmament process was undertaken by Chamberlain as Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1934, especially with the development of fighters. Churchill might have been considered for inclusion in Baldwin’s cabinet (1935–37), but his outspokenness in defence debate prevented this. The Anglo-German Naval Agreement (1935) was criticised by Churchill, but Hitler was going to build in any case.

Meanwhile, Chamberlain’s continuing development of rearmament is demonstrated by his fighting the election of 1935 on the issue of rearmament rather than appeasement. Churchill’s reaction to events such as the reoccupation of the Rhineland (March 1936), the resignation of Eden as Foreign Secretary (February 1938), the Anschluss (March 1938) and the Sudetenland Crisis (September 1938) will need careful analysis. Churchill’s principal claim about the Second World War was that it was unnecessary, it could have been prevented and it was appeasement and a failure to rearm that helped to bring it about. Chamberlain was blamed also for failing to create a triple alliance of Britain, France and the USSR.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. A range of interpretations are possible: that Chamberlain was naive and that he was taken in by Hitler; that Hitler was a reasonable Chancellor behaving in a traditional way and that Germany’s ‘war guilt’ should be assuaged; the

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	72

memories of the First World War were fresh and public opinion was influenced by pacifism; public opinion was strongly in favour of Chamberlain's stance, certainly at the time of Munich; the state of the economy was unable to support sufficient rearmament; Britain was not prepared for war in 1938; Chamberlain was buying time.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

4 Explain Churchill's aims for the settlement of post-war Europe and estimate his success.

[30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected. It is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Candidates may begin their answers with some consideration of the campaign for the liberation of Europe in June 1944 (D-Day). Nevertheless, some earlier context may well be relevant, for example, the Atlantic Charter (wider than Europe) and the Teheran Conference (Nov–Dec 1943) with its discussion of UNO and the coordination of the Second Front in France. With Operation Overlord well in train, the Quebec Conference, between Churchill and Roosevelt in September 1944, was not very successful (with discussion of the Morgenthau Plan). Churchill's visit with Eden to Moscow in October 1944 was concerned with further discussions with Stalin and Molotov over Poland, Greece and Eastern Europe more generally. The key issue was Poland (issues regarding territory and the Lublin government). In addition, spheres of influence in the Balkans were outlined with the proposal of 'percentages'.

In November 1944, Churchill was in Paris to meet de Gaulle for Armistice Day celebrations. By the end of 1944, Churchill was exercised by the prospects of a Communist government in Greece and made a personal visit to Athens in late December 1944. But Churchill was not able to terminate the civil war in Greece. Candidates may see the relevance of the major bomber offensive against Germany (early 1945) – intense area bombing with the aim of shortening the war (and thus helping to settle the European war). In February 1945, the Yalta Conference may be regarded as the least successful of the wartime conferences – it was dominated by the issues arising out of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference (and the setting up of UNO) and the settlement of Poland (here Churchill probably did as well as he could, given the circumstances). Churchill was also concerned to reverse Roosevelt's decision to limit the US army of occupation in Europe to two years. The Potsdam Conference was punctuated by the British general election with Churchill attending the earlier sessions and Attlee and Bevin the latter. As a postscript, answers might be expected to make an evaluation of the 'Iron Curtain' speech in Fulton, Missouri, in March 1946.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	72

A02 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Churchill's success needs to be assessed within the context of the relative decline in importance of Britain's role, certainly by the second half of 1944, and with the success of Overlord and the liberation of Western Europe. Meanwhile, the success of the USSR's advance into Eastern Europe and the invasion of Germany (including the occupation of Berlin) help to put Churchill's contribution to the settlement of post-war Europe into perspective. It might also be argued that the relationship between Roosevelt and Churchill was not as close as it might have seemed.

A03 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

A04 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.